

**THE MINUTES OF THE
NORFOLK ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MARCH 7, 2016**

On March 7, 2016 at 4:00 p.m., a meeting of the Norfolk Architectural Review Board was held in the 10th Floor Conference Room, City Hall Building. Those in attendance were:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms. Gustavson (Chairman), Mr. Thomas, Mr. Rutledge, Mr. Glenn, Ms. Pollard, Mr. Lyall, Mr. Gould

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Mr. Klemt, Mr. Hoffler

STAFF:

Ms. McBride, Mr. Newcomb, Mr. Simons, Ms. Markowski

I. Call to Order

Ms. Gustavson called the meeting to order.

II. Roll call

Mr. Newcomb called the roll. (Quorum present.)

III. Consent Agenda

a. Meeting minutes – February 8, 2016

Mr. Lyall made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Ms. Pollard seconded the motion. The Board voted aye.

- b. Meeting minutes – February 22, 2016

Mr. Rutledge made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Ms. Pollard seconded the motion. The Board voted aye.

- c. 201 E. City Hall Avenue – Anders Williams Building – Entrance renovations

After review of drawings, photographs and detailed specifications, Mr. Lyall made a motion to approve the application as presented. Mr. Rutledge seconded the motion. The Board voted aye.

- d. 131 Granby Street – Jack Brown’s – Outdoor dining and lighting encroachment

Mr. Thomas asked that the item be removed from the consent agenda.

IV. Continued Applications

Private Project

- a. 519 Front Street – Building encroachment & development waivers

Drawings and photographs were presented for review. The application was presented to the Architectural Review Board in January 2016 for an encroachment and development certificate waivers. The development certificate waivers are for building placement in relation to property lines and for parking, with a requirement for a walkway along the river if there will be surface parking within a certain vicinity. At that time the Architectural Review Board recommended denial of the application and asked the applicant to consider creating a walkway for public access to the water. The applicant has applied for Historic tax credits.

The application was next reviewed by the City Planning Commission in February 2016. The City Planning Commission remanded the application back to the Architectural Review Board. They asked the applicant to provide a plan for a walkway or other alternatives.

The applicant considered how a walkway could be accomplished. They are proposing a walkway between the parking lot and the existing building. This would give people direct access to a 16-foot wood deck that connects to a 12-by-24-foot floating dock. The wood deck could also be linked to the property to the west and it

would line up with the dog park to the east. The applicant is proposing to install the necessary support piers within the proposed riprap shoreline improvements as part of this Phase I. This would allow for the walkway to be installed at a later date under Phase II of the development. The walkway would provide a continuous walkway connection to the west at the time redevelopment occurs to the west of this property. Staff recommended waivers for building placement, parking, and public right-of-way to the water. The Downtown Civic League supports the project.

Mr. Thomas relayed to the Board that the City Planning Commission discussed not only the walkway along the building but also a walkway along the waterfront where the parking lot is. One of the reasons the Commission remanded the application back to the Board was because they want to see the walkway along both sides of the property. They also discussed the importance of the walkway being built now as opposed to in the future so as to encourage new development to the west.

Mr. Reidy and Mr. Molzahn appeared before the Architectural Review Board. They asked the Board to allow them time to work through the details with the Department of Historic Resources. Mr. Reidy stated that a plan for the walkway had been submitted to the Department of Historic Resources. Ms. Pollard added that the walkway was in their initial plan but the Department of Historic Resources wanted additional details about the design of the handrails, decking, et cetera. Mr. Newcomb added that they expect revisions to have occurred for Fort Norfolk by the time Phase II of this development occurs.

Ms. Gustavson noted a correction to the January 25, 2016 minutes for the project. The correction should state: “The building’s first floor plate will be raised 6 feet above grade in order to comply with FEMA requirements.”

Mr. Newcomb read the following motions.

- Approve the encroachment for 519 Front Street.

Mr. Thomas, Mr. Gould, Ms. Gustavson, Mr. Glenn, Mr. Lyall and Mr. Rutledge voted aye. Ms. Pollard abstained.

- Approve the development certificate waiver pertaining to the setbacks of the building itself.

Mr. Thomas, Mr. Gould, Ms. Gustavson, Mr. Glenn, Mr. Lyall and Mr. Rutledge voted aye. Ms. Pollard abstained.

- Approve the development certificate waiver pertaining to off-street parking subject to the following conditions:
 - a) The site shall be developed generally in accordance with the concept site plan entitled “Layout and Utility Plan of Front Street Apartments” prepared by MSA, P.C., dated December 1, 2015, attached hereto and marked as Exhibit A, subject to any revisions required to be made by the city through the city site plan review and building permit review process.
 - b) Engineered foundation piers designed generally in accordance with the foundation plan entitled “Foundation/Existing First Floor Slab Plan new work prepared by Sinclair Pratt Camron, P.C., dated December 19, 2015, revision number 3, dated February 29, 2016, attached hereto and marked as Exhibit B, shall be installed and sufficient to accommodate a 12-foot public walkway beginning from the property’s primary southern entrance and extending westward to the western property line to be installed within 24 months of the issuance of the permit.
 - c) Any subsequent changes to the project described in the staff report as approved through this development certificate shall be reviewed as an amendment to development certificate.

Mr. Thomas, Mr. Gould, Ms. Gustavson, Mr. Glenn, Mr. Lyall and Mr. Rutledge voted aye. Ms. Pollard abstained.

V. Certificate of Appropriateness

Downtown Historic Overlay

- a. 201 E. City Hall Avenue – Anders Williams Building – Entrance renovations (**Approved on consent.**)
- b. 131 Granby Street – Jack Brown’s – Outdoor dining and lighting encroachment

No action taken. The application was continued. The Board asked that the applicant consider an alternative treatment with alternative materials.

Drawings and photographs were presented and Ms. McBride reviewed the application. The applicant would like to install a barrier for outdoor dining that can be moved inside and outside easily. The barrier is proposed to project out 4 feet 8 inches from the building and run 16 feet in width for a total of 80 square feet. The barrier is

comprised of 6 galvanized buckets with a wood post set in concrete in each of the buckets. Two jute ropes are threaded through two holes in each of the buckets for the posts. The ropes are the “rails” and they swag between the posts. There will be three black metal mesh tables and two chairs.

Mr. Henn appeared on behalf of the applicant. He noted that this barrier is identical to the applicant’s other locations in Richmond and Harrisonburg. Mr. Thomas stated that some type of railing is required under the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control. He added that he had received comments from the Downtown Civil League and Downtown Council that this is a very narrow sidewalk and they preferred the removable barrier so it can be taken inside when not in use. Ms. Pollard stated that the treatment proposed is very rustic and its placement is inappropriate in front of such a monumental facade.

VI. Design Review

Private Projects

a. 765 Granby Street – Outdoor dining encroachment

Drawings and photographs were presented and Ms. McBride reviewed the application. The applicant had submitted a proposal for outdoor dining as follows: The encroachment would be 5½ feet out from the building by 23½ feet across the front. A bench will be integrated into the railing system with an umbrella attached. The railing is 2 inch square metal painted black. The bent metal dining surface is attached to the top rail and the bench is attached to the bottom rail and has an 11¼ inch piece of wood for the seat. Black canvass umbrellas were proposed.

Mr. Derenoncourt and Ms. Thomas appeared before the Board. Ms. Thomas distributed handouts showing an optional design. Rather than the umbrella she proposed a “tee-pee” angled roof shape and attached to the rail itself. The encroachment will be 18 inches over the rail and will provide the cover as required by the Public Health Department.

Mr. Lyall made a motion to approve the updated application provided on 3/7/16 as presented reflecting a change in the overhead awning and the fabric color. Mr. Glenn seconded the motion. The Board voted aye.

VII. Discussion

- a. Draft application for demolition

Ms. McBride stated that the Board's changes had been incorporated. With regard to the structural engineering report, Ms. Pollard asked to add the language "included but not limited to" or appropriate language noting that a report should be included. Mr. Glenn added that it should be a detailed report that includes the structural damage, repairs and costs.

VIII. Public Comments (None)

IX. New Business

Ms. Gustavson relayed that Talbot Hall has been entered into the National Register of Historic Places.

X. Old Business

Ms. Gustavson read a letter from the Ghent Neighborhood League thanking Mr. Lyall for his service as Chairman of the Architectural Review Board.

Ms. Gustavson stated that Ms. Pollard will give a presentation on tax credits for the Board's first learning session.

Mr. Newcomb reminded the Board it's time to set goals for 2016 and to be thinking about what work program they would like to do this year.

Ms. Gustavson noted that Ms. McBride sent information to the Board with regard to training.

Ms. Gustavson distributed a handout for the Historic Garden Week tours.

XI. Approval of the minutes: February 8 & 22, 2016 (Approved on consent.)

XII. Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dolores R. Cloud

Dolores R. Cloud, Deputy City Clerk/Stenographic Reporter